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Reviewer's report:

I think the authors have largely done well in revising the paper. I particularly think the inclusion of dummy variables for schools strengthens the analysis. I think this is a perfectly acceptable alternative to multi-level modelling and may even be more appropriate in this instance considering that the schools were not randomly selected. I do have some outstanding issues, detailed below:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. The additional detail regarding the limitations of the question on marital status which has been added to the discussion is good, but I still feel greater justification is needed in the introduction as to why parental marital and migratory status are considered to be measures of SES. It is not sufficient to say that they appear from previous research to be related to mental health. They could each be related to the mental health of adolescents through mechanisms unrelated to SES such as indicating family conflicts or stresses associated with accommodating two cultures. With the FAS measure for example, the items are described and it is summarised as a ‘resource-based indicator of SES’, but there is no comparable explanation of what socioeconomic resources are represented by parental marital and migratory status. The authors need to establish why they view these measures as representing the socioeconomic resources available to the adolescents in their study.

2. In the discussion of the opposing associations with individual FAS items for girls’ mental health (page 10) it is suggested that the opposing associations will influence the total FAS score. I think it is more about how they affect the association between the total FAS score and mental health, the opposing associations for individual items may cancel each out resulting in no association between the total score and girls’ mental health.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. The footnote in table 1 is still unclear, and probably unnecessary anyway.

2. Table 2 is still not mentioned explicitly in the text. Please add a sentence such as “Table 2 shows...” before describing the results in this Table.
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